

- 7 -

### Remarks

The present response is to the Office Action mailed in the above-referenced case on April 15, 2004. Claims 7-13 are presented below for examination. The Examiner has rejected claim 12 under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite. In response, applicant herein accompanies with the present filing, a proposed drawing addition which clearly illustrates an embodiment of the present invention, wherein the air foil is adjustable in one or both of direction and/or spacing, as recited in the claim language, and supported by the description in the specification.

Applicant acknowledges the restriction requirement and applicant's subsequent election of claims 7-13, and has withdrawn claims 14-25.

Claims 7-8 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by reference (JP404056631A), hereinafter '631A. Claims 9-13 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over '631A in view of ordinary skill in the art. Applicant has carefully studied the prior art presented by the Examiner, and the Examiner's rejections and statements of the instant Office Action. In response, applicant herein amends the language of claim 7 to more particularly point out and distinctly claim the patentable subject matter of applicant's invention, which the prior art reference provided by the Examiner clearly and unarguably fails to produce, suggest or intimate. Applicant further provides argument pointing out the key and patentable aspects of at applicant's invention, as recited in the claims as amended and supported in enabling detail in the specification, which clearly have advantageous and patentable distinctions over the prior art presented.

Applicant herein amends the language of claim 7 to specifically recite that the upper foil is connected to and spaced apart from the base foil by a plurality of

- 8 -

support fins creating separate airflow direction channels, characterized in that the channels formed between the upper and lower air foils by the plurality of support fins function to redirect airflow in a path substantially parallel to the windshield, forming a bug shield of moving air. Applicant reproduces claim 7 below as amended for convenience.

Claim 7 as amended now recites:

*7. (currently amended) An airfoil for directing an airflow shield to prevent bugs and other lightweight debris from hitting the windshield of a moving vehicle comprising:*

*a base foil having a forward protruding lip for collecting incoming airflow and an upright curvature substantially following the angle of protrusion of the windshield from the vehicle; and*

*an upper foil connected to and spaced-apart from the base foil by a plurality of support fins creating a plurality of separate airflow channels, at a position elevated from and substantially parallel to the base foil;*

*characterized in that the channels formed between the upper and lower airfoils by the plurality of support fins function to redirect airflow in a path substantially parallel to the windshield, forming a bug shield of moving air.*

Applicant now wishes to direct the Examiner's attention to applicant's specification with reference to figures 4 and 5, illustrating a front view and side view, respectively, of the airfoil apparatus of applicant's invention according to a preferred embodiment. Referring now to Fig. 4, foil 302 is held in an elevated and substantially parallel position from base foil 303 by a plurality of standoff fins 304 distributed strategically along the width of foil 301, creating multiple separate

- 9 -

airflow direction channels, which channel the air in each separate channel in slightly different angles of direction relative to one another. This is due to the fins disposed left of center being angled slightly to the left and the fins disposed to the right of center angled slightly to the right, as shown in the illustration. The airflow through the airfoil is thereby directed in a strategic fashion so as to spread the flow evenly over the windshield.

In contrast, the apparatus taught by reference '631A does not teach or suggest such multiple support fins creating multiple separate airflow channels, as taught in applicant's invention, and now recited in applicant base claim as amended. Referring now to '631A, a device 10 is provided to generate airflow in front of the glass and to reduce or prevent adhesion of rainwater, utilizing an inlet port in the front for gathering moving air, and a discharge port in the rear for discharging a lateral flow of air over the windshield. The invention however is quite limited in its function, compared to applicant's invention, in that that there is no teaching, suggestion or intimation of a separate upper and lower airfoil spaced between each other by a plurality of support fins which form multiple airflow direction channels from the inlet to the outlet of the apparatus. The device of '631 is provided for generating an airflow over the front glass to reduce or prevent adhesion of rainwater, while in contrast, applicant's invention teaches an airfoil for directing an airflow shield for preventing insects or other lightweight debris from striking the windshield. The reference, therefore, teaches an alternative invention with a different expected result, and the lack of a plurality of support fins forming multiple separate airflow channels within the airflow device as taught in '631, clearly distinguishes applicant's invention over that of the prior art, and there is no motivation suggested in the teachings of '631 for such arrangement of vertical support fins.

- 10 -

Furthermore, in addition to the unique multiple separate airflow channeling enabled by the strategic location of the plurality of support fins 304 between the upper and lower airfoils, applicant's invention has an upright curvature substantially following the angle of protrusion of the wind from the vehicle, which provides for a smooth airflow through the airfoil device, reducing turbulence at a discharge end of the device. Said upright curvature is also recited in applicant's base claim 7. The invention of '631A, on the other hand, provides no such upright curvature; rather, the device appears to channel airflow first parallel to the surface of the hood of the vehicle, and then abruptly at the rear of the device, channels the airflow at a distinct angle upward, parallel to the windshield, not the gradual airflow direction change as provided by the curved shape of applicant's upper and lower airfoils.

In view of applicant's claim amendments, proposed drawing correction and argument provided herein, applicant is confident that the invention as recited in claim 7 as amended and described in the specification in enabling detail, is now clearly and unarguably patentable over the prior art presented by the Examiner. Claim 7 now specifically recites a plurality support fins forming multiple separate airflow direction channels characterized in that the channels function to redirect airflow in multiple paths substantially parallel to the windshield, forming a bug shield of moving air. Claim 7 is therefore patentable over the reference provided by the Examiner, and depending claim 8 is patentable on its own merits, or at least as depended from a patentable claim.

The Examiner has rejected claims 9-13 as being unpatentable over '631A in view of ordinary skill in the art. Claims 9-13 are all claims dependent from base claim 7, which is now patentable as amended over the prior art presented. Claims 9-13 are then patentable on their own merits, or at least as depended from a patentable claim.

- 11 -

As all of the claims standing for examination have been shown to be patentable as amended over the art of record, applicant respectfully requests reconsideration, and that the present case be passed quickly to issue. If there are any time extensions needed beyond any extension specifically requested with this amendment, such extension of time is hereby requested. If there are any fees due beyond any fees paid with this amendment, authorization is given to deduct such fees from deposit account 50-0534.

Respectfully Submitted,

John Stephenson Neel

by



Donald R. Boys  
Reg. No. 35,074

Donald R. Boys  
Central Coast Patent Agency  
P.O. Box 187  
Aromas, CA 95004  
(831) 726-1457



## UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1459  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/615,639	07/08/2003	John Stephenson Neel	P1381D1	1426
24739	7590	07/29/2004	EXAMINER	
CENTRAL COAST PATENT AGENCY PO BOX 187 AROMAS, CA 95004			PATEL, KIRAN B	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			3612	

DATE MAILED: 07/29/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

10/615,639

COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE  
P.O. BOX 1450  
ALEXANDRIA, VA 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

Paper No.

## Notice of Non-Compliant Amendment (37 CFR 1.121)

The amendment document filed on 6-2-04 is considered non-compliant because it has failed to meet the requirements of 37 CFR 1.121, as amended on June 30, 2003 (see 68 Fed. Reg. 38611, Jun. 30, 2003). In order for the amendment document to be compliant, correction of the following item(s) is required. Only the corrected section of the non-compliant amendment document must be resubmitted (in its entirety), e.g., the entire "Amendments to the claims" section of applicant's amendment document must be re-submitted. 37 CFR 1.121(h).

THE FOLLOWING CHECKED (X) ITEM(S) CAUSE THE AMENDMENT DOCUMENT TO BE NON-COMPLIANT:

- ☐ 1. Amendments to the specification:
- ☐ A. Amended paragraph(s) do not include markings.
  - ☐ B. New paragraph(s) should not be underlined.
  - ☐ C. Other \_\_\_\_\_
- ☐ 2. Abstract:
- ☐ A. Not presented on a separate sheet. 37 CFR 1.72.
  - ☐ B. Other \_\_\_\_\_
- ☐ 3. Amendments to the drawings: \_\_\_\_\_
- ☒ 4. Amendments to the claims:
- ☒ A. A complete listing of all of the claims is not present.
  - ☒ B. The listing of claims does not include the text of all claims (including withdrawn claims)
  - ☐ C. Each claim has not been provided with the proper status identifier, and as such, the individual status of each claim cannot be identified.
  - ☐ D. The claims of this amendment paper have not been presented in ascending numerical order.
  - ☐ E. Other: \_\_\_\_\_

For further explanation of the amendment format required by 37 CFR 1.121, see MPEP Sec. 714 and the USPTO website at <http://www.uspto.gov/web/offices/pac/dapp/opla/preognotice/officeflyer.pdf>.

If the non-compliant amendment is a **PRELIMINARY AMENDMENT**, applicant is given **ONE MONTH** from the mail date of this letter to supply the corrected section which complies with 37 CFR 1.121. Failure to comply with 37 CFR 1.121 will result in non-entry of the preliminary amendment and examination on the merits will commence without consideration of the proposed changes in the preliminary amendment(s). This notice is not an action under 35 U.S.C. 132, and this **ONE MONTH** time limit is not extendable.

If the non-compliant amendment is a reply to a **NON-FINAL OFFICE ACTION** (including a submission for an RCE), and since the amendment appears to be a *bona fide* attempt to be a reply (37 CFR 1.135(c)), applicant is given a **TIME PERIOD** of **ONE MONTH** from the mailing of this notice within which to re-submit the corrected section which complies with 37 CFR 1.121 in order to avoid abandonment. **EXTENSIONS OF THIS TIME PERIOD ARE AVAILABLE UNDER 37 CFR 1.136(a).**

If the amendment is a reply to a **FINAL REJECTION**, this form may be an attachment to an Advisory Action. The period for response to a final rejection continues to run from the date set in the final rejection, and is not affected by the non-compliant status of the amendment.

Eric Dantale  
Legal Instruments Examiner (LIE)

703-208-3757  
Telephone No.

Rev. 10/03